DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 096 430 CE 002 031

AUTHOR	McArthur, Virginia A.
TITLE	From Convict to Citizen: Programs for the Woman Offender.
INSTITUTION	District of Columbia Commission on the Status of Women, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jun 74
NOTE	45p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22151
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Community Programs; *Correctional Rehabilitation; Corrective Institutions; Criminals; Criminology; *Females; *Prisoners; Programs; *Rehabilitation Programs

ABSTRACT

Women offenders have needs that can be met through concerted action by individuals or community groups. To familiarize community groups with the problems of women offenders and to describe some programs to assist them, the booklet begins with a brief description of the criminal justice process and describes the place of women offenders in this process. Innovative and transitional programs to help offenders at the four stages of the criminal justice process are described. Among these are pretrial programs, programs for women in jail or prison, transitional programs to ease the reintegration of women offenders into the community, and community programs to help them achieve full citizenship on their return. Recommendations are provided for groups that wish to help women offenders, followed by information on where financial and other assistance can be obtained. Also included are a nine-item bibliography, a list of law enforcement assistance administration regional offices, a manpower administration regional office list, and a list of rehabilitation programs. (Author/BP)

ED 096430

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FROM CONVICT TO CITIZEN: PROGRAMS FOR THE WOMAN OFFENDER

by

Virginia A. McArthur

District of Columbia Commission on the Status of Women
Washington, D. C.
June 1974

CE 002 031

FROM CONVICT TO CITIZEN was prepared for the District of Columbia Commission on the Status of Women under grant number 92-11-72-05 from the Manpower Administration, U. S. Department of Labor. Opinions expressed in this booklet do not necessarily represent the official position of the Department of Labor.

Copies of this booklet [illegible] from

District of Columbia Commission on
the Status of Women
Room 204 - District Building
14th and E Streets, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20004
(202) 629-5238

and

National Technical Information
Service
Springfield, Virginia 22151

District of Columbia Commission on the Status of Women
Officers and Members, 1973-1974

Mrs. Mary Dublin Keyserling
Chairman

Hon. John B. Duncan
Vice Chairman

Mrs. Violet J. Darius
Secretary

Mrs. Helen S. Lewis
Executive Director

Ms. Geraldine P. Boykin
Mr. William Calomiris
Sharyn G. Campbell
Dorothy B. Ferebee, M. D.
Ms. Carol Tucker Foreman
Miss A. Patricia Frohman
Dr. Mary T. Howard
Mrs. Jehu L. Hunter
Gilda Iriarte

Ms. Mary Janney
Dr. Timothy L. Jenkins
Ms. Esther C. Lawton
Ms. Jeanne E. Lea
Dr. Shirley McCune
Mrs. Martha Mallard Mitchell
Mrs. Emmett C. Selden
Mrs. Joy R. Simonson
Ms. Doris D. Wooten

CONTENTS

FOREWARD.....i

INTRODUCTION.....1

OVERVIEW.....2

The Criminal Justice System.....2

Women in the Criminal Justice System.....4

PROGRAMS.....9

Pre-Trial.....9

Detention and Incarceration.....11

Transition.....16

Community.....18

RECOMMENDATIONS.....23

Understanding Reentry Problems.....23

How You Can Help.....26

RESOURCES.....28

Federal Government Funding.....28

Foundations.....30

Other Resources.....31

Selected Bibliography.....32

Addresses.....34

TABLES

Table 1. Selected Arrest Statistics by Sex, 1972.....6

Table 2. Arrest Trends by Sex, 1960-1972.....7

FOREWARD

The District of Columbia Commission on the Status of Women has advocated a vigorous action program to ensure that the special problems of female offenders receive attention both in the planning of detention facilities and in the operation of programs, and has called specifically for additional community—based rehabilitation centers, expansion of probation services, increased volunteer involvement, elimination of sex-stereotyping of training and job placement programs, development of relevant education programs, and consideration of the decriminalization of prostitution.

To focus attention on the special problems of female offenders, the D. C. Commission on the Status of Women conducted two days of public hearings in November 1971. More than fifty witnesses testified, and the Commission subsequently reported to local officials and to the public our findings and recommendations for action to facilitate the rehabilitation of female offenders. (See Female Offenders in the District of Columbia, Congressional Record, May 22, 1972, pp. E 5535 - 5541.)

As an extension of our interest in the rehabilitation of female offenders, in cooperation with the Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor, and under a grant from the Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, the Commission undertook, with Ms. Tyra S. Garlington as chief investigator, a study of rehabilitation projects affecting women offenders. After Ms. Garlington's investigation was completed, we invited Ms. Virginia McArthur to use the report of that investigation and other current literature to prepare a manuscript for publication that would give an overview of innovative projects and programs -- including ideas and recommendations that may not yet have been tested --combined with practical suggestions for interested individuals and organizations who may wish to become involved in the heretofore neglected area of rehabilitation of female offenders.

As a Commission on the Status of Women, our concern is with all women, including women offenders. Our premise is that in dealing with all offenders, the objective is rehabilitation, not punishment. Ms. McArthur has skillfully prepared a report that offers practical suggestions to citizens and organizations wishing to work for rehabilitation.

In addition to the work of Ms. McArthur and Ms. Garlington, we gratefully acknowledge the advice, assistance, and encouragement rendered by Mrs. Elizabeth Duncan Koontz and her successor as Director of the Women's Bureau, Ms. Carmen Maymi, by Mrs. Elsie Denison, Women's Bureau staff who served as technical liaison to this project, and by Mr. William Throckmorton and Mr. Thomas Joyce, Office of Research and Development, Manpower Administration, U. S. Department of Labor.

We hope that Commissions on the Status of Women throughout the country, as well as other women's organizations, civic groups, and interested citizens will find in this publication useful suggestions for initiating and mobilizing support for programs to improve the rehabilitation of women offenders in their states and communities.

Mary Dublin Keyserling
Chairman
D. C. Commission on the Status of Women

Dorothy B. Ferebee, M.D.
Chairman, Criminal Justice Committee
D. C. Commission on the Status of Women

UNTITLED

See over there - the girl in red,
Elizabeth Cottage is where they've got
her bed.
She works in food service all day
To earn her 66 cents of pay.

If she doesn't get shock she'll hit the
board.
Her pleas for freedom will be ignored.
So 'till Board Day she'll do her chores.
Washing dishes and mopping floors.

If perchance she doesn't run
She'll meet the board, and then anoth-
er one!
Within that time she may make honor
And learn to sew or maybe to launder!

Someday she'll face that Magic Board
They'll say "GET OUT!" "HIT THE
DOOR!"
"Take what we've taught you and
make a good life,
Be a good citizen, mother, and wife."

As she departs, she'll shed a few tears
Thinking of the people, the time, the
years
As she glances back one last time,
She'll thank God she finally paid for
her crime!

Jessica Bell

From The Outlaw, January 1974
Journal of the Prisoners Union

FROM CONVICT TO CITIZEN: PROGRAMS FOR THE WOMAN OFFENDER

Virginia A. McArthur*

When you're in prison, time stops. You come out with the same problems you go in with - and start all over again with their twelve extra rules of parole in addition.

"Jeanette"
Ex-inmate of
Bedford Hills Prison[1]

Women offenders have needs that can be met through concerted action by individuals or community groups. This booklet was designed by the District of Columbia Commission on the Status of Women to acquaint community groups across the country with the problems of women offenders and to describe some programs to assist them. Its intent is to encourage groups to take affirmative steps to aid women offenders.

This booklet discusses a variety of programs that can be duplicated by volunteer groups to assist women offenders at all stages of the criminal justice process. Among these are pre-trial programs, programs for women in jail or prison, transitional programs to ease the reintegration of women offenders into the community, and community programs to help them achieve full citizenship upon their return.

Groups with varying ranges of expertise, interest and organizational capability can help women offenders. The tasks to be accomplished are many and varied, from fighting for new laws, to planning and directing a full-scale rehabilitative program, to driving a woman offender's mother to the prison on visiting day. Through this booklet you may become aware of some of the ways your group can help women offenders.

This booklet begins with a brief description of the criminal justice process and then describes the place of women offenders in this process. Innovative and traditional programs to help offenders at four stages of the process are described. Recommendations are provided for groups that wish to help women offenders, followed by information on where financial and other assistance can be obtained.

*Director of Research, Center for Correctional Justice, Washington, D. C.

1. Kathryn Watterson Burkhart, Women in Prison (New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1973), p. 90.

The Criminal Justice System

The criminal justice process is complex. In order to provide a context for the discussion of women offenders' problems and needs, several steps in the criminal justice process are outlined below. These steps occur in the processing of men and women who are charged with felonies--that is, serious crimes for which they could receive sentences of longer than one year. Misdemeanors are less serious offenses with lesser penalties. Although the steps outlined below are typical, there are numerous local variations in procedure and even in definitions and names of offenses.

Crimes may become known to the police by direct observation of either the crime or suspicious circumstances, or through a citizen's complaint. If the suspect is not caught in the act of committing a crime, as is most often the case, the police will conduct a pre-arrest investigation. This investigation will involve interaction between a suspect and the police, ranging from one or two questions to a full search of the suspect based on a warrant. About 10 to 15 percent of the time[2] those investigations result in arrest, or the taking into custody of a person for the purpose of charging her with a crime. After arrest, a suspect will be "booked," that is, her name, offense involved and the time of the arrest will be recorded. In many jurisdictions, depending on the type of offense being charged, she may also be fingerprinted, photographed, and requested to supply a handwriting sample. She will likely be detained by the police, although some arrestees are released at this stage through informal police practices.[3]

The prosecutor next reviews the report of the arresting officer on each suspect who is held, and decides whether or not to charge the defendant with an offense, and if so, which offense to cite. If no offense is charged, the case is "no papered," and the defendant is released.

Within a few hours of arrest the defendant has an "initial appearance," or "presentment," before a magistrate or judge. At this time the magistrate or judge informs the defendant of her rights and decides whether she must be detained or is eligible for release on bail (payment of an amount to the court to ensure that the defendant will return for trial), third-party custody (to a responsible relative, friend or organization), or personal recognizance (release based on a defendant's personal characteristics and community ties). The bail amount is set, where applicable.

The "preliminary hearing" follows the initial appearance. At this hearing, which can be waived by the defendant, the prosecutor presents evidence to convince the magistrate or judge that there

2. Livingston Hall and others, Modern Criminal Procedure (St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Co., 1969), p. 8. This estimate includes all suspects, male and female.

3. Ibid., p. 8.

is probable cause to believe the defendant committed a felony. The defendant may also offer evidence and cross-examine witnesses. The purpose of the hearing is to screen out unwarranted prosecutions. If the judge decides there is probable cause, the defendant is "bound over" for trial; if there is no probable cause, the defendant is released.

In some states a grand jury must "indict" the defendant, or approve the decision to prosecute. This body of citizens meets privately with the prosecutor to hear the evidence. If the grand jury votes for prosecution, the defendant is next "arraigned," or brought before the trial court and informed of the charges against her and the pleas she might enter. Counsel for indigent defendants will be appointed at arraignment. Defendants who already have counsel will usually enter their pleas at arraignment.

The next step is trial. Felony defendants have a right to trial by jury, although this right is waived about 40 percent of the time.[4] Defendants who are convicted are sentenced in the discretion of the judge, within the limits set by law. His decision can take into account the convicted person's work and home situation, the nature of the offense, and any other information he thinks relevant. Based on this information, he may decide to suspend imposition of the sentence, fine the convict, put her on probation, or incarcerate her, depending on the penalties allowed by law for her offense.

If a woman is incarcerated she will almost always return to the community. Her return can be "supervised," under conditions of parole or release to a residential community program, or "unsupervised," as in the case of prisoners who serve their full terms behind bars.

At every stage of the process, large numbers of people are dropped out, either through lack of evidence, a finding of innocence, or use of community release alternatives to detention and incarceration. Thus, in 1970 there were over 6.5 million arrests of both men and women,[5] but fewer than 80,000 admissions to federal and state prisons.[6]

4. Ibid., p. 12.

5. Federal Bureau of Investigation, Crime in the United States: 1970 (Washington: U.S. Department of Justice, 1971), Table 30, p. 12.

6. National Prisoner Statistics, "Prisoners in State and Federal Institutions for Adult Felons" (Washington, April 1972), Bulletin No. 47, p. 6.

Women in the Criminal Justice System

Although females comprise over half of the United States population, this fact is not reflected in the criminal justice system. Of the 6.5 million arrestees in 1970, only 1 in 7 was a female.[7] In jail, (where defendants await trial), only 1 person in 19 was a female.[8] Only 1 in 22 persons admitted to prison (where convicts serve their time) was female,[9] and of those in prison on a given day, only 1 in 35 was female,[10] since women serve shorter terms than men.

Several reasons have been suggested for this disproportionately small number of women in the criminal justice process. One is the "chivalry factor,"[11] or the traditional attitude of deference toward women which leads to leniency on the part of police and courts. Another is that the types of crimes many women commit--crimes such as child abuse, petty theft, blackmail--are such that they are likely to go unnoticed.[12] A third suggested reason is that men are considered more dangerous and thus are treated as if they are.[13]

There are similiarities between men and women in prison. Both groups tend to be drawn from the poor, the less educated, the powerless of society. Officials in the system--police, prosecutors, judges--use a great deal of discretion in administering justice. Their decisions tend to favor the white middle class. One study noted a "black shift" effect in the District of Columbia Women's Detention Center:[14]

7. F.B.I., 1971, op. cit.

8. 1970 Census of Population, Persons in Institutions and Other Group Quarters (Washington: U. S. Department of Commerce, Social and Economic Statistics Administration, Bureau of the Census, July 1973), p. 5.

9. National Prisoner Statistics, op. cit., p. 6.

10. Ibid.

11. Walter Reckless and Barbara Ann Kay, The Female Offender, 1967. (Consultants' report to the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice).

12. Edith Elisabeth Flynn, "The Special Problems of Female Offenders," We Hold These Truths, Proceedings of the National Conference on Corrections, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, December 1971.

13. Burkhart, op. cit., p. 78.

14. Colleen Barros, Andrea Slavin, Virginia McArthur and Stuart Adams, Movement and Characteristics of Women's Detention Center Admissions, 1969 (District of Columbia Department of Corrections, May 1971), Research Report No. 39, p. ii.

> ...although the female population of the District aged 18 and over is only 63% black, first bookings into the Women's Detention Center are 73% black, returns to WDC from initial court hearings are 83% black, cases sentenced for 30 days or more are 92% black, and cases sentenced for three months or longer are 97% black.

Among the differences between men and women in the criminal justice system, probably the most notable is the offenses for which they become involved. In 1972, according to the Uniform Crime Report, an annual publication of the FBI giving national arrest statistics and other criminal justice system information, arrests of females were 15.1 percent of the total number reported to the FBI.[15] Table 1 compares arrests of males and females for index crimes. The overrepresentation of females in arrests for index crimes, 18.0 percent instead of the 15.1 percent that would be expected on a proportional basis, is attributable entirely to the arrests for larceny, of which 29.7 percent were of females.

In non-index crime categories, arrests of females exceed the 15.1 percent overall average by a wide margin for forgery, fraud, embezzlement, prostitution and commercialized vice, and vagrancy. Male arrests, on the other hand, are especially high in robbery, burglary, and auto theft among the index crimes, and vandalism, weapons offenses, drunkenness and driving while drunk, among the others. All persons reported to the FBI as arrested for forcible rape were male.

Arrest trends, which are also reported by the FBI, show that the pattern of arrests in changing. As Table 2[16] indicates, female arrests for property index crimes are rapidly rising.

15. Federal Bureau of Investigation, Crime in the United States: 1972 (Washington: U. S. Department of Justice, 1973), Table 34, p. 129. The data in Table 1 are all selected from Table 34 of the FBI report. Note that the figures are for arrests of "females," not "women." The Uniform Crime Report, as the FBI report is known, has one table giving arrest statistics by age and sex, which would permit separating arrest statistics for women from those for girls, but this table reports statistics for a much smaller number of jurisdictions than Table 34.

16. Data in Table 2 are taken from the 1972 Uniform Crime Report, Table 30, p. 124.

Table I: Selected Arrest Statistics By Sex, 1972

	Total Arrests	Female Arrests	Male Arrests
All Offenses			
no.	7,013,194	1,057,411	5,955,783
pct.	100	15.1	84.9
All Index* Crimes			
no.	1,417,115	255,205	1,161,910
pct.	100	18.0	82.0
Violent Index Crimes			
no.	299,221	29,953	269,268
pct.	100	10.0	90.0
Property Index Crimes			
no.	1,114,908	224,901	890,007
pct.	100	20.2	79.8

*"Index" crimes comprise the seven categories of offenses used by the FBI to measure the distribution and level of crime in the United States. "Violent" index crimes are murder, forcible rape, robbery and aggravated assult. "Property" index crimes are burglary, larcency and auto theft.

Table 2: Arrest Trends By Sex, 1960-1972

Arrests For		1960	1972*	Percent Change
All Offenses	Female	339,233	629,655	+85.6
	Male	2,774,127	3,555,216	+28.2
Index Crimes	Female	45,443	157,340	+246.2
	Male	394,107	716,181	+81.7
Violent Index Crimes	Female	9,622	21,144	+119.7
	Male	82,318	181,675	+120.7
Property Index Crimes	Female	35,648	136,000	+281.5
	Male	310,287	533,233	+71.9

*The figures for arrests in 1972 in this table differ from those in Table 1 because they aggregate reports from different numbers of jurisdictions.

Data about women offenders are scarce, but thanks to a recent awakening of interest in their problems, some information is now becoming available.[17] This information indicates that the average education levels of female prisoners range from a low of grade five in some prisons to a high of grade ten in others.[18] It has been established that as many as 30 percent of the women in prison were on welfare before they were incarcerated.[19] Another study of available records indicated that 80 percent of the women in Pennsylvania jails had dependent children,[20] a finding that clearly distinguishes female from male prisoners. All of these findings have implications for the kinds of programs that would most help women offenders.

The differences between incarcerated men and women have been too little explored. Although women account for 15 percent of all arrests, they constitute only five percent of the incarcerated population. Consequently, female prisoners have been virtually ignored. A review of ten years of Department of Labor Manpower Administration support of correctional programs focusing primarily on research and development efforts, 113 pages long in printed form, covered programs for women in half a page, because female offenders "did not play a major role in the offender projects."[21]

It is evident that much more research is needed--particularly research on the special problems of women offenders. Even at the present state of knowledge, however, it is possible to identify some programs or ideas for programs which have potential for helping women offenders. The next section of this booklet will discuss some of these programs. Some exist now; others are just possibilities. Some are programs for women; others are designed for men. All seem worthy of replication. The programs are considered in connection with the stage of the criminal justice process at which they might be most helpful.

17. For instance, two books called Women in Prison were published in 1973. Both are cited elsewhere in this booklet.

18. Edna Walker Chandler, Women in Prison (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc. 1973), pp. 126-127 (Appendix).

19. "Review of Manpower Programs for Offenders," Internal Department of Labor Memorandum, 1973.

20. Marjorie Velimesis, Report on the Survey of 41 Pennsylvania Court Court and Correctional Services for Women and Girl Offenders, (American Association of Universi' Women, 1969).

21. Roberta Rovner - Pieczenik, A Review of Manpower R & D Projects in the Correctional Field (1963-1973), (Washington: U. S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, 1973) Manpower Research Monograph No. 28, p. 2.

Pre-trial

The first stage at which a woman who has become involved in the criminal justice process needs help is arrest. An abrupt interruption in her routine leaves a myriad of loose ends--did she leave her apartment door unlocked, will the children wonder where she is, how will she pick up her paycheck, and so on.

One program that attempts to handle the emergency needs of women who have been arrested is the Visitors' Services Center (VSC),[22] in the District of Columbia. Established three years ago by an energetic, if small, group of volunteers, the VSC serves men in the D. C. Jail, women in the Women's Detention Center, and their families. The volunteers who conceived the VSC obtained financial support from two church organizations. Through the D. C. Department of Corrections, these funds were matched with funds distributed through the local agency of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. The money permitted the group to pay a small staff to recruit, train and coordinate volunteers from a cross-section of the community.

The volunteers and the central staff of a program like the VSC need have no professional expertise. They do not offer legal assistance, psychological counseling or medical care, although they can refer clients to these services. What the VSC does offer is a hand in time of need. The VSC will make phone calls, move cars, lock apartments, locate paychecks due a woman who is jailed, drive family members to the Detention Center--in short, do any number of small acts which require no special training. As volunteers learn whom to call for a variety of information and assistance, they are able to expand their services to clients.

One service offered by the Visitors' Services Center which is among those most needed by women who have just been arrested is assistance in getting bail money. A woman's bail amount may be more than she can readily pull together. The Visitors' Services Center will contact family members and friends to see whether they can raise the bail money, and will, on occasion, drive to the homes of these people to pick up the money and deliver it to the court.

Bail practices can discriminate in favor of the rich.[23] The Manhattan Bail Project of the Vera Institute of Justice in New York, now several years old, was the first major attempt to reduce the imbalance. Project staff members interview defendants to determine whether

22. Addresses of the VSC and other programs are listed in the back of this booklet.

23. An excellent reference on the injustices of American bail practices is Ransom, by Ronald L. Goldfarb (New York: Harper and Row, 1965).

on the basis of their community ties and position they appear likely to return for trial. The answers to several questions are scored according to a system developed through Vera's experience, and a recommendation for or against pre-trial release is made to the court.

Defendants released on recognizance through Vera's program have had a lower rate of non-appearance for trial than defendants on regular bail. Bail Project results also indicate that defendants who are on bail before trial have a lower rate of conviction and incarceration than those who are jailed before their trials. Based on these experimental findings, the Bail Reform Act was passed. Most states now have a bail agency for determining the availability of release on recognizance (ROR), using criteria developed by the Manhattan Bail Project.

Women who are not released on bail or personal recognizance may be eligible for "third-party custody" release. In third-party custody, a relative, friend, or organization is given the responsibility of seeing that the offender appears in court at the proper time.

Four third-party custody programs exist in the District of Columbia. One of these, the Washington Dismas Project, is run entirely by volunteers under the auspices of the Josephite Pastoral Center. The project serves offenders from a geographically defined part of the city. A volunteer determines from the Bail Agency records which defendants, male and female, are from the part of the city served by Dismas. The defendants are interviewed, and their lawyers contacted. Defendants who wish to use the project's services are accompanied at arraignment and other court appearances by a "standby," a volunteer who provides moral support and transportation. Defendants in the Dismas Program are required to make one personal visit and two phone calls per week to project staff. The duration of program involvement is generally three months, until disposition of the case.

In some cities, defendants may be released to a pre-trial intervention program of counseling and job or school placement. The pioneering pre-trial intervention program was another project of the Vera Institute of Justice in New York, the Manhattan Court Employment Project. Originally funded by a grant from the Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, the project is now funded by the City of New York.

The project works with selected defendants to help them become better established in the community before trial. Defendants who qualify for the program must be approved for participation by the prosecutor and the presiding judge, and their cases are adjourned for 90 days. At the end of the 90-day period, participants return to court with a report recommending dismissal of the charges, an extension of the adjournment to allow for further counseling, or resumption of the prosecution of the defendant's case without prejudice.

Participants in the program first undergo orientation in a group session where they are told what will be expected of them in the program. Throughout the 90 days various counseling techniques are employed to "help participants articulate their feelings, to understand their behavior, to act responsibly and to direct themselves toward a constructive goal."[24]

24. The Manhattan Court Employment Project, Final Report (New York: Vera Institute of Justice, 1972), p. 9.

The second major component of the program is, as the project calls it, "career development." Career Developers (CDs) on the staff talk to potential employers to find out what their employee needs are and whether they would be willing to interview qualified program participants. The Career Developers maintain contact with employers to be sure that the employees referred by the project are satisfactory. About a third of the participants in the Manhattan Court Employment Project have to be placed more than one time during their stay with the Project.

The staffing and financial requirements of a project as ambitious as the Manhattan Court Employment Project, which had a total of 1300 participants in its first three years, are large. There is one counselor/supervisor "Representative" (an ex-offender paraprofessional) for each 15 to 25 participants. The caseloads of each two Representatives and CDs are supervised by one supervisor who has an assistant.

During the first year of project operation, 38.9 percent of the participants were recommended for and were granted dismissal of their cases. Employment of defendants rose, average income rose, and the rate of rearrest of participants dropped as the project's experience lengthened. Although the project cost almost a million dollars in its first three years, it saved the court processing time, resulted in the employment of many people who might otherwise not have become productive members of society, and allowed more families to stay together.

Approximately 30 cities now have pre-trial intervention projects, usually focusing on male defendants, but sometimes also including females. Project Crossroads, a District of Columbia program modeled after the Vera program and servicing both female and male defendants, was successful enough to be taken over by the D.C. Superior Court after initial Department of Labor funding. Although some intervention projects exclude defendants charged with prostitution because of a prevailing pessimism about the utility of services for them, a large portion of the Crossroads female clients have had that charge. Project Crossroads has found that women charged with prostitution respond better to pre-trial intervention services than does the typical female offender.

Some observers have suggested that pre-trial intervention programs can be operated more easily for female defendants than for male defendants because there is less public opposition to keeping female offenders in the community. Although more of these programs exist to serve men than women, concerned community groups could do much to create or increase pre-trial opportunities for female defendants.

Detention and Incarceration

Women who are in jail awaiting trial or in prison after conviction may be helped by a variety of programs. According to a special report by the U. S. Bureau of the Census, there were 6,390 women aged 18 and over in state and federal prisons in mid-1970, and another 7,061 held in jails and workhouses either untried or serving short sentences.[25] Because of turnover, many more women are exposed to jails in a year than these figures suggest.

25. 1970 Census of Population, op. cit., p. 5.

One type of program that can fill a need for both convicted and untried women in short-term facilities as well as longer-term institutions is visiting. The importance of visiting programs is hard to overstate. In one California study, male inmates who maintained close contact with family and friends were found to be significantly more successful on parole. The study recommended that[26]

> All restrictions on visitors and mail should be closely scrutinized with an eye to eliminating all regulations whose purpose is other than protecting the absolute basic security of the institution. No restriction should be allowed to remain the only reason for which is lack of space. Space must be found. The effectiveness of family contact is such that very high priority should be given to finding space that may be utilized to increase the frequency of family contacts.

Women who have no family or friends to visit them might welcome regular visits from a volunteer. The volunteer in a one-to-one relationship promises to visit regularly--for example at least once a week--and may, at the time of release, help an inmate reestablish herself in the community. One program for male prisoners in the District of Columbia, Man to Man, links volunteers from the community with inmates at the District's correctional complex. Volunteers are recruited, screened, coordinated and matched with inmates by a small paid staff. The program is funded by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

Other programs can be helpful to short-termers. For example, the Visitors' Services Center in the District of Columbia is planning a series of seminars for Women's Detention Center inmates concerning topics of consequence to them. Sample topics are landlord-tenant law and creditors' rights.

Many correctional officials welcome offers by qualified personnel to present lectures or classes on a variety of topics. The courses are valuable not only for their content and the diversion they afford the inmates whose schedules leave them seemingly endless empty hours, but also for the contact they provide between the imprisoned population and the free world. Perhaps the greatest hope for eventual improvement of the criminal justice system, and corrections in particular, is an increase in the number of outsiders who are exposed to it. Such people can see the system's weaknesses, and in numerous ways work to eliminate them.

* * * * *

Women who have long prison sentences will generally be assigned to one or more of three types of activities: (1) prison industries, (2) academic education, or (3) vocational training.

(1) Prison industries is not primarily a rehabilitative program. For wages ranging from nothing (in Maine, North Carolina and Texas) to a maximum of

26. Norman Holt and Donald Miller, Explorations in Inmate - Family Relationships (Research Division, Department of Corrections, State of California, January 1972), Research Report No. 46, p. vii.

$2.40 per day in Iowa or $45 per month in Illinois (for certain types of work),[27] women prisoners work at dead-end jobs like flag-making, sewing uniforms for inmates and making mops, among others. In some cases industrial programs do perhaps provide training that will be useful to women after release, but too often training seems to take second place to making a profit from the industry. Federal Prison Industries, Inc. with factories in the federal prisons, made a 17 percent profit on sales in 1972, which has been compared with an average 4.5 percent profit for all U. S. industries.[28]

A study now under way at the Institute of Criminal Law and Procedure at Georgetown University Law Center in Washington, D. C. is examining the role of prison industries and will recommend specific measures and programs to improve prison industrial programs.[29]

(2) Academic Education. All of the 30 U. S. women's prisons that responded to a recent survey reported that their academic education programs went at least through high school; seventeen also had some college classes.[30] Because relatively few inmates have completed high school, and because a high school diploma is required for so many jobs, the quality of prison high school education is of great consequence to inmates. Although extensive involvement by outsiders in prison high school programs is not common, volunteers could conceivably do much to help upgrade prison education programs at all levels.

College-level instruction in women's prisons ranges from the non-credit creative writing course taught at the Correctional Institute for Women at Shakopee, Minnesota by volunteer instructors from Macalester College, to the more highly developed Newgate programs in Missouri and New Mexico.[31] Newgate originated as an Office of Economic Opportunity Program, but the present funding in Missouri is primarily from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. Four colleges and universities in Missouri combine to offer courses for credit. In Spring 1972, a total of 13 three-credit courses were offered at four Missouri prisons, including two at the women's prison in Tipton.

27. Chandler, op. cit., pp. 134-135.

28. Jessica Mitford, Kind and Usual Punishment (New York: Alfred A. Knopf 1973), pp. 196-197.

29. "The Role of Prison Industries Now and in the Future: A Planning Study," funded by Department of Labor Manpower Administration.

30. Chandler, op. cit., pp. 126-127.

31. The information about college programs comes from an unpublished survey of college-level correctional education programs made in October 1973 by Edward J. Drury of the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs at the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis campus.

In the College of Santa Fe program in New Mexico, male and female inmates of the Penitentiary of New Mexico can earn an Associate of Arts degree in prison if they are serving enough time. Santa Fe also has a study release program in which students go to the campus during the day and return to the penitentiary at night. Funding for the program comes from several sources, including an estimated $25,000 per semester from the college.

(3) Vocational Training Programs. An excellent recent report, A Guide to Correctional Vocational Training,[32] describes 66 training programs for prisoners. Of the 66 programs described in the report, eight involve female prisoners. To illustrate the range and variety of vocational training for prisoners, seven of the 66 programs, including six of those for women, will be described briefly in the categories used in the Guide. The feasibility of instituting the following programs in a given situation depends on many variables such as prison regulations, proximity of the institution to schools and businesses, employment needs in the community, cost, and level of interest among businessmen, educators and union leaders.

School and College Cooperative Programs. The Community College Night Owl classes are taught by Jackson Community College faculty for the men at the State Prison of Southern Michigan. Program participants are transported to the community college to use its facilities at night, when the regular students are not using them. Classes in business, electrical wiring, electronics, data processing and machine shop skills are taught from 9:30 P.M. to 3:00 A.M. Applicants for the program are interviewed by the education staff in the institution and the college. In order to be eligible, inmates must meet an educational requirement and have enough time left to serve to complete the program. The program is funded through the state education office.

The vocational program at the Minnesota Correctional Institution for Women in Shakopee, Minnesota is not so highly structured as the Jackson Community College Program. The "program" consists of institutional personnel who aggressively seek individual opportunities for inmates to be trained in nearby vocational schools, business schools, a community college, and a medical institute. Students' educational backgrounds, nearness to release and maturity are taken into account in locating appropriate placements. The salaries of the coordinator and a community service worker come from the department of education budget, and the vocational rehabilitation division pays the cost of training. Total funding is estimated at $25,000 per year.

Business and Industry Cooperative Programs. Honeywell Information Systems,

32. New England Resource Center for Occupational Education, Newton Massachusetts, and Far West Laboratory for Educational Research, San Francisco, A Guide to Correctional Vocational Training (produced pursuant to a grant from the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Bureau of Adult Vocational and Technical Education, with technical support by Division of Manpower Development and Training), July 1973.

Inc. teaches inmates at three Massachusetts prisons, including the coed prison at Framingham, several skills associated with data processing. Among these are computer logic, programming in several computer languages, systems design and keypunching. The company supplies teachers for the advanced courses and money for books and supplies. Inmates administer the program and teach the elementary courses. The institutions provide work and classroom space and a keypunch machine. At one of the prisons no computer is available, but at the other two (including Framingham), second generation computers have been donated by the company, enabling more advanced material to be taught.[33]

Trade Union Cooperative Programs. The Institutional Training Project, sponsored by the Metropolitan Baltimore Council AFL-CIO, teaches welding, diesel mechanics, pipefitting and carpentry at three Maryland prisons. The program at the Women's House of Corrections in Jessup is welding. Classes are taught by workers in large companies in the Baltimore area, whose leaves of absence are approved by both the companies and the union. The program is funded by Model Cities Program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. In order to qualify, inmates must be from the Model Cities neighborhood of Baltimore and within 10 months of work release eligibility or parole. Of the first 550 people trained by the project, 390 had been placed by mid-1973, and many of the others had jobs waiting. The program costs HUD about $480,000 per year.

Professional and Paraprofessional Programs. The California Institute for Women in Frontera has a program to train Licensed Vocational Nurses (practical nurses). In order to be eligible for the program, an inmate must pass a 12-week nurse's aide course at the prison hospital, meet IQ and educational requirements and have a year left to serve before parole. The full course takes 46 weeks, and is accredited. The course includes some classwork, which takes place in the institution, and training in a community hospital for 24 hours per week. About a third of the students are dropped for not being able to follow directions or act as team members. All of the first 46 graduates of the program obtained employment immediately. The program costs $52,000 per year, including salaries, and is supported by funds from the department of corrections and the division of vocational rehabilitation.

New Approaches in Traditional Courses. Another program at Frontera is a cosmetology training program which prepares inmates to pass the state licensing examination. The program is administered by the department of corrections, and takes about one year to complete. Applicants must have at least a tenth grade education

33. The writer has learned that the program description in the vocational training guide may be misleading. Women at Framingham apparently learn only keypunching. They work on contracts for agencies of the Massachusetts government. Nevertheless, if the truth about the vocational training programs does not live up to their descriptions, the descriptions are valuable for the ideas they contain.

or its equivalent. Students spend one hour per day in the classroom and another six hours in "shop" giving manicures, scalp treatments, haircuts, and so on. The course instructor was a successful operator of a hairdressing shop before joining the prison staff. The supervisor, who teaches the advanced classes, is also licensed by the state. The first 29 graduates of the program passed the state licensing examination and were placed in related jobs. Implementation of a similar program elsewhere would cost an estimated $9,500.

Short-Term and Pre-Vocational Programs. One program of vocational training at the Robert F. Kennedy Youth Center in Morgantown, West Virginia is designed to introduce male and female wards to air conditioning and refrigeration, power technology, interpretive blueprint reading, graphic arts, metals and several other areas of "industrial literacy." The courses are designed so that students meet performance objectives at their own rates. As they meet each performance objective on a list distributed at the beginning of the course, that objective is checked off. When all have been checked, the course work is completed. The purpose of the course is to help residents decide what vocation they would like to pursue and to provide entry level skills. The prime requisite for program participation is interest.

Transition

The programs described above were started on the assumption that career training will help prisoners become established in employment after prison and thus "go straight." It is not sufficient, however, to establish a well-run vocational training program. One study made of the vocational training programs at Frontera (before the two programs described above were in full swing) "failed to demonstrate that vocational training has any effect upon parole outcome."[34] Two reasons were (1) that the vocational training courses were largely confined to the same kinds of unskilled and semi-skilled jobs the women had held before being sent to prison, and (2) that job placement assistance was inadequate or totally absent. Thus, if a vocational training program is to positively affect parole outcome, it must (1) train prisoners for jobs for which there is and will be a shortage of trained personnel, and (2) link trained prisoners with jobs through adequate placement services.

The difficulty of making these two vital links with the community is increased by characteristics of the prisons themselves, particularly women's prisons. Because there are so few women's prison--only 33 states maintain separate prisons for women[35] --those that do exist hold women from widely divergent geographic locations (with varying employment markets) and are located far from the areas to which most of the inmates will go upon

34. Carol Spencer and John E. Berecochea, Vocational Training at the California Institute for Women: An Evaluation (Research Division, Department of Corrections, California, January 1971), p. 30.

35. According to a count made from listings in the Directory, Juvenile and Adult Correctional Institutions and Agencies (College Park, Maryland: American Correctional Association, 1973). Some states contract with other states to house their women offenders. Other states house women prisoners in sections of men's prisons or other institutions.

release. The District of Columbia, for example, contracts with the federal prison at Alderson, West Virginia, 250 miles away, to take D. C. women with long sentences.

One program that addresses aspects of the transition problem is the One America Key Program, administered by a private minority enterprise, One America, Inc., and assisted by the United Church of Christ (UCC) and the Delta Sigma Theta Sorority. In its first 18 months of operation, the program worked with 200 women at the federal reformatory in Alderson who were to return after release to 22 localities in which the sorority or the UCC had a member who could recruit volunteers to give support services to the women.

In its first 18 months the project maintained a counseling staff at the institution and field staff in the 22 communities. The institutional staff helped inmates develop a "parole plan," or post-release plan. Such a plan typically includes an address or living situation to which the inmate will go upon release, and evidence of some means of support, such as a guaranteed or fairly certain job. Often, special conditions must be met by a plan, such as a promise by the inmate to enroll in a narcotics addiction treatment program in her city.

The field staff of the One America program consisted of a paid coordinator--a member of either the sorority or the UCC--and a volunteer staff recruited and maintained by the coordinator. The field staff performed a variety of services for inmates, both during incarceration and after release. For example, they found prospective employers, maintained contact with the participants' families and parole officers, found housing and child care facilities. Volunteers met with participants to whom they were assigned at least once a week after release.

The program was originally funded by a discretionary grant of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, the Manpower Administration of the Labor Department and the Bureau of Prisons. The money was routed through the Small Business Administration of the Commerce Department.

In its second 18 months the program is working with state women prisoners in Ohio and Tennessee. Although the program is similar to the previous one for Alderson prisoners, there is no longer a formal relationship between the One America Corporation and the United Church of Christ and the Delta Sigma Theta Sorority. One America now uses volunteers from other groups, including the League of Women Voters, Chamber of Commerce, and others. The project is now funded by both the Labor Department and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

Another program that was designed to provide a smooth transition from institution to community was Project New Hope of the District of Columbia Department of Corrections. This project had a two phase design. In Phase I, which was to last about 30 days, Women's Detention Center inmates were to undergo assessment and screening involving psychological and other tests, followed by a period of vocational and motivational training, basic education lessons, and counseling.

In Phase II, women who qualified were to attend college, while others went into on-the-job training programs, to be supplemented in some cases by training at a vocational training school in Washington. During Phase II, participants were to live

either at home or in the halfway house for women. After successfully completing their training, the women were to be hired for paraprofessional social service positions by the government agencies they worked in during the training period. Commitments to hire trainees were obtained from several District of Columbia agencies before the funding application was submitted to the Department of Labor.

Project New Hope was prematurely terminated because of severe administrative difficulties. Nevertheless, the concept of guaranteed placement is well worth copying, as is the concept of government commitment to employment of ex-offenders. In many regions government agencies lag far behind the private sector in ex-offender hiring.

Community

After incarceration or in lieu of incarceration, a woman may be placed in a community correctional program. Across the country, two-thirds of the people in the care of corrections departments are in the community,[36] either in residential facilities such as halfway houses (also called community correctional centers), or on probation or parole.

Halfway houses are used in at least three ways: (1) as pre-trial facilities to permit defendants to continue working until trial, (2) as short-term institutions where misdemeanants may serve all or most of their short sentences, and (3) as work and study release centers for prisoners who will soon be eligible for parole.

Probation and parole are forms of supervised freedom--the former term usually applying to supervised release in lieu of incarceration and the latter usually denoting post-incarceration supervised release.

In a work or study release program, prisoners go into the community to attend academic classes, work or seek work during the day, and then return to confinement in the evening.[37] Work and study release programs usually include some counseling and job development. Often as a work releasee's record of success in the program lengthens, he or she will be given free time in the community and will be permitted to earn an overnight or weekend pass. In many programs work releasees pay

36. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, February 1967), p. 161 (Table 2).

37. Work release legislation exists in 44 states, the District of Columbia, and the federal system. Richard M. Swanson, Work Release: Toward an Understanding of the Law, Policy, and Operation of Community - Based State Corrections (Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency and Corrections, Southern Illinois University, 1973), p. 10.

rent out of their earnings. They also pay taxes and may send money to their families.

Although work and study release programs are sometimes based in prisons, community-based work release programs have a number of attractive features. One of these is the provision of an alternative to the extravagantly high cost of locking up prisoners. The per capita cost of keeping a woman at the D. C. Women's Detention Center during the quarter October to December 1973 was $41.42 per day[38] (not counting money for capital expenditures). While this cost is extraordinarily high, it is becoming increasingly difficult to find a prison that operates at a cost lower than $5,000 per year per inmate. Although the per capita cost can be reduced by increasing the institutional population, in view of the demonstrated failure of our prisons to rehabilitate, it makes more sense to seek alternatives.

Inmates in work release programs perform useful work in society (or they will be fired) and are paid the going wage. The money they earn is returned to society through payment of taxes, payment of rent to the department of corrections, and personal expenditures in the community. Aside from the tax revenue accruing to the government, the government may also be relieved of part of its welfare burden due to the prisoners' increased ability to support their families.

One cost analysis of the District of Columbia work release program estimated that "the cost to society of maintaining an inmate in the Department of Corrections is...reduced by about half by placing a man on Work Release rather than in an institution."[39] This estimate did not account for any savings that might have been produced by reductions in recidivism attributable to the program. It accounted for money paid to dependents and creditors, taxes and return to the government for rent.

In addition to the economic arguments, community programs also permit offenders to lead a more nearly normal life than most jails or prisons allow. Perhaps partly for this reason, (and the idea that convicts should be punished), opposition to placement of offenders in community programs--both residential and non-residential--can run high. This is particularly true of residential programs since they concentrate offenders in one or more easily identified locations.

Opposition to community correctional centers for women ought to be less strong than opposition to such programs for men. As the District of Columbia Commission on the Status of Women pointed out in its statement opposing construction of a new women's prison unit 20 miles outside of Washington, D. C.[40]

> female offenders are much less threatening than male offenders. Save in exceptional cases, women offenders do not commit violent crimes. Their presence in

38. Information from D. C. Department of Corrections Accounting Office.

39. Virginia McArthur, Barbara Cantor and Sara Glendinning, Cost Analysis of the District of Columbia Work Release Program (Washington: District of Columbia Department of Corrections, Research Report No. 24, June 1970), p. ii.

40. Statement presented to the National Capital Planning Commission, Wednesday, October 4, 1972, in opposition to construction of a Residential Center D. (for women) at Lorton as described in the Lorton Master Plan. Government of the District of Columbia, Commission on the Status of Women, p. 3.

neighborhood correctional facilities would therefore not arouse the kind of hostility and opposition that unfortunately often accompanies proposals for establishing neighborhood facilities for male offenders.

But the neutralization of community opposition takes work. One program that has dealt successfully with the community is Talbert House for Women in Cincinnati, Ohio. Residents of this halfway house include Federal Bureau of Prisons inmates (under a contractual arrangement), probationers who are failing in the community, and work furloughees six months before their parole eligibility. The house holds about 15 women, which is the maximum the administrator believes to be desirable.

Talbert House has been accepted by its neighbors. The administrator attributes his success with the community to laying the proper groundwork. Months before the house opened, he and his staff attended community meetings, worked for the community, and involved community residents in planning the program. Cincinnati leaders serve on the house's board. There have been no acts of vandalism against the house in the two years it has been open.

A second group that has had success in winning support for community programs is the Department of Court Services in the Fifth Judicial District of Iowa. Despite its official-sounding title, this group began 10 years ago with one small, privately-funded project. An editorial writer for a Des Moines newspaper, after a trip to New York in which he learned about the Vera Institute's Bail Project, wrote a few enthusiastic editorials and decided Des Moines should have such a project. It was started with foundation money, a small group of private citizens and the cooperation of a municipal judge sitting on criminal cases.

The Department of Court Services now administers four distinct community programs: the original release on recognizance program, plus a pre-trial intervention program, a probation and pre-sentence investigation program (staff supervise probationers and prepare background studies for judges to use in sentencing), and two community residences — one for men, one for women. The Department is now funded by the state and LEAA, and covers the 20 percent of the state's population in the Fifth Judicial District. In June 1973 the legislature passed a bill to make the program statewide. In 1979 the state will assume the costs of the program. The acceptance of this program by the people of Iowa, as represented by their legislators, is due to careful and hard work and close communication with the judges who use the Department's services. The judges use the program because they know it well, through daily communication and semiannual conferences with project staff.

One community program concept that is gaining popularity is "supported employment." Washington Opportunities for Women (WOW), with assistance from the Bureau of Rehabilitation, both of which are private nonprofit organizations in the District of Columbia, has developed a supported employment program which was recently funded by the local LEAA office and private foundations. The program plan takes into account the special needs of women in three ways: (1) most of the women probationers in the program have children, (2) the jobs for which the women will be trained are in non-traditional occupations which are more highly compensated than the jobs usually available to women, and (3) the

program will provide a full range of supportive services. The emphasis is on employment, not therapy.

WOW decided to train women in construction trades and other "blue collar" jobs for two reasons: (1) "clusters" of jobs will be available in those fields (clustering of offender employees enables them to provide mutual support), and (2) the jobs promise upward mobility and high pay. Construction training, for example, will last six weeks, with placement in jobs paying $6.37 per hour. The program will begin in late spring of 1974.

The proposed job-related supportive services to be provided by the program (as needed) read like a catalog. They are a) individual, group and family counseling; b) child care stipends; c)health care--medical and life insurance benefits until the trainee is covered by her employer's fringe benefits; d) housing assistance--as required--and emergency residential supervision in community residences presently operated by the Bureau of Rehabilitation; e) urine surveillance and drug counseling; f) material assistance--transportation money for the first month, and a small loan fund for emergencies; g) legal aid--assistance in identifying legal problems and in locating aid when necessary through a community legal aid organization; h) community resources education--how to find child care, food stamps, health clinics, etc.; i) career counseling--designed to fill gaps in the target group's knowledge about the world of work; and j) coeducational job counseling--to ease the way for female trainees entering nontraditional employment. In addition, the project will provide remedial classes aimed at attainment of a GED (General Equivalency Diploma - substitute for high school diploma).

The bill for these support services in one version of the proposal came to more than $6,000 per trainee, including reimbursement to employers for release time. Although the cost is high, both WOW and the Bureau of Rehabilitation believe these services must be available to women probationers to give them the start they need on the road to full citizenship. Furthermore, compared with the cost of incarceration, $6,000 may not be unreasonable.

A supported employment project in New York, the Pioneer Messenger Service Project of the Vera Institute of Justice, found that the support services it offered were not all required by its participants. The project participants were people who were deemed "unemployable" because of their poor work histories, addiction to drugs or alcohol, or histories of incarceration. But the Pioneer Messenger Service was a business. When the customer's needs conflicted with the supportive programming, the customer came first. Pioneer found that, "a participant's messenger work success, and capacity to handle more responsible work, bore little relation to his attendance at therapy sessions or participation in them."[41] What counted most was on-the-job success.

To share in these feelings of success, ex-offenders must have a chance to work, but there are barriers to the employment of ex-offenders. For example, many occupations for which licenses are required are closed to former prisoners or people who have been arrested. The American Bar Association's National Clearinghouse on Offender Employment Restrictions in Washington, D. C., has studied the restrictions against licensing of ex-offenders

41. "The Pioneer Messenger Service," Vera Institute of Justice, New York, 1972.

in several occupational areas. In its book, Laws, Licenses and the Offender's Right to Work,[42] the Clearinghouse found "1,948 different statutory provisions that affect the licensing of persons with an arrest or conviction record."[43] A table at the end of the book lists 307 licensed occupations by state, showing which states will not license persons with arrest or conviction records. The table will be useful to anyone planning a vocational training program for prisoners.

Ex-offenders seeking employment may be asked to acquire bonding. The Department of Labor Manpower Administration since 1966 has supplied fidelity bonds for ex-offenders who are barred from employment for a specific job solely because they cannot get a commercial bond. The program is administered through 2,200 local Employment Service offices.

42. James W. Hunt, James E. Bowers, and Neal Miller, Laws, Licenses and the Offender's Right to Work (Washington: American Bar Association, 1973).

43. Ibid., p. 5.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Understanding Reentry Problems

The foregoing discussion of programs for the rehabilitation of offenders touches on a number of problems they suffer--lack of education, poor or nonexistent job skills, unstable work history, poor self-concept, and unfamiliarity with community resources. But the problems of ex-offenders upon reentry into society are more extensive than this short list would suggest.

In his book, The Felon,[44] which concerns male offenders but is probably largly applicable to females as well, John Irwin discusses three types of reentry problems: those that arise immediately after release, those arising after the ex-con is back on his feet, and those which arise because he is under the supervision of a parole agency. The problems in the first group are complex, "involving extreme personal stress, psychological 'symptoms,' and problems of 'resocialization,' as well as the more obvious adjustment problems, such as locating employment."[45] This "culture shock" may go completely unnoticed by the parole officer, who may think that in addition to finding work the ex-con's primary adjustment task is to obey the law and the conditions of parole. Irwin quotes parolee after parolee talking about his first few days after release. "I don't know, man, I was just depressed the first few days. It was nothing I could put my finger on." "The thing I remember was how lonely I was out there the first few weeks."[46] Reaction to the changed world may be slow and uncomprehending. Inability to keep up with the rest of the world can create self-doubt and self-estrangement, says Irwin.

In addition to these very real but ignored problems are the more obvious problems of survival. Women who are released from prison may receive bus fare or money up to $100 upon release.[47] Two states provide no money to offenders on release, and over half give less than $40,[48] an amount that does not last long in today's world if one is without employment. For some ex-cons, this "gate money" may be their only support until they find work.

Parolees seeking work have to decide whether to tell the truth or lie about their imprisonment. If they tell the truth they risk not being hired, but if they lie and are later found out, they may be fired. One

44. John Irwin, The Felon (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970).

45. Ibid., p. 108.

46. Ibid., p. 114.

47. Chandler, op. cit., pp. 138-139.

48. Kenneth J. Lenihan, "The Financial Resources of Released Prisoners," Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc. (on Department of Labor Grant 91-11-71-32), Washington, D. C., March 1974 (draft), p. 9.

woman went without employment for nine months because when she was honest no one would hire her. She lied and found a job as a bookkeeper for $85 a week. She worked on the job for five years, but did not tell her employer that she was a parolee until she had been on the job for a year. "When I finally told him, he gave me a raise. He was very honest, though, and told me he didn't know if he would have hired me or not if he had known I was an ex-con."[49] According to one woman, it is easier for a woman parolee to lie. She "can explain away five years on a resume as 'housewife' whereas a man has to account for the time."[50]

Irwin points out that problems after release can concern everything from residence, clothing and transportation to "taking care of business."[51] In order to save money, parolees will often stay in skid row hotels or cheap rooms that accentuate the often unexpected post-release depression. The clothes given an inmate upon release become dirty when it is important for the parolee to be presentable to prospective employers, but cleaning bills may be intolerable for the rapidly dwindling cash on hand. Transportation costs can take a big chunk out of the money available before employment is found. Finally, parolees may be ill-equipped to organize their time and manage the details of their life because of the regimentation to which they have become accustomed in prison.

Problems can be created by the parole conditions, too. Parolees have to live up to a higher standard than citizens who have never been convicted of a crime. In addition to being required to maintain a job, they must avoid associating with certain people or kinds of people, avoid getting drunk, and report regularly to the parole officer. Parolees may even have to be home by a certain time of night, and obtain the parole board's permission to marry, leave the state or get a driver's license. In addition, participation in special programs may be required as a condition of parole. Violation of any condition entails a risk of return to prison.

What constitutes a successful reentry? According to Irwin,[52]

> from the standpoint of the felon a successful postprison life is more than merely staying out of prison. From the criminal ex-convict prespective it must contain other attributes, mainly it must be dignified.

49. Burkhart, op. cit., p. 91.

50. "A Woman Reflects on Prison Past," Interview with Sandi Sutton, Fortune News (New York: The Fortune Society, November 1973), p. 4.

51. Irwin, op. cit.

52. Ibid., p. 204.

This accords with the idea of another sociologist that what keeps criminals criminal is alienation.[53]

> What is needed is a way of returning the offender to the community with as little differentiation as possible. I suggest that this end may be achieved by stressing his similarities to us. To the extent that the criminal sees himself as different from us, he will play the obvious role of a criminal. To the extent that he sees himself as more or less like anybody else, he will become part of that indefinable mass of people to which we all belong: the community.

In other words, we must make the ex-offender a citizen.

53. John Conrad, "Reintegration: Practice in Search of Theory," Reintegration of the Offender into the Community (Washington: U. S. Department of Justice, June 1973) Criminal Justice Monograph, p. 21.

How You Can Help

Your volunteer group may want to help women offenders become full citizens but you may not know where to start or how to put your energies to the best use. The following recommendations may suggest some projects.

1. Read. Begin with materials listed in the selected bibliography and footnotes, and go on from there. Bibliographies on women offenders are now becoming available. Information on how you can obtain two of these bibliographies is given in "Resources," below.

2. Study your community's criminal justice system. Find out where women in your community go when they are arrested, sentenced, and return to community life. Attend a trial. Ride in a police car. Visit the jail. Find out who controls funds for prisoners in your state and community. How interested are these people in helping women offenders? How can citizens' groups make sure the problems of women offenders are not dismissed as insignificant?

3. Compile facts and figures on women offenders in your community. How many are arrested? Convicted? How many have private lawyers, and how many have court-appointed lawyers? What sentences are the women getting? How many get probation? How many have children for whom they are responsible? How many have a history of drug addiction? You need facts and figures to plan programs, and to obtain funding to establish programs. (High school and college students might be willing to help gather this information for school projects.)

4. Find out what community resources exist for offenders. One way to do this is to prepare a directory of prisoner assistance programs in your area. Such a directory could list all the groups that serve offenders or ex-offenders, their activities, criteria for eligibility for the services they offer, and names and addresses of contacts at the organization. In the course of this investigation, your group could also identify organizations that refuse to help offenders.

5. Keep your local newspaper informed of conditions of prisoners and ex-prisoners, of correctional programs and budgetary allocations. Bring to the public more information about women prisoners. Don't let them be ignored because of their numerical minority in the system.

6. Meet officials in the criminal justice system. Find out what they are doing, are planning, or would like to do for women offenders. Discuss your group's interest in helping women offenders. Identify people in the system who will support your efforts. Invite them to talk to your group.

7. Talk to women offenders to determine what kinds of programs they believe would be most useful.

8. Develop tentative plans for a few programs. Discuss these with officials and try to obtain their support.

Different groups have different strengths. Groups with connections in the state legislature, for example, might consider undertaking a project to reduce legally sanctioned restrictions on employment of ex-offenders, particularly in occupations

with high concentrations of female employees. Groups with strong community ties might undertake projects aimed at easing the reintegration of women offenders after incarceration, or projects to build support for community residential programs. Other groups might concentrate on heightening public awareness of offenders' problems—particularly those of women offenders—and ascertaining the views of public officials and candidates for elective office on the proper treatment of women offenders.

If the program your group has decided to undertake requires financial support, you will need to put your program plans on paper. Some government agencies, such as the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice (often called NILE), the research arm of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), and private foundations will want to see a "concept paper" before they ask for the details of your plan. This paper can be in the form of a long letter or a four to five page document. It will cover briefly all the information to be given at more length in the full proposal.

A check list of points to cover in a "proposal letter" to foundations was supplied in Behavior Today:[54]

- need for project
- previous work on subject or work-in-progress
- other support committed to you, if any
- if junior investigator, references familiar with your work
- rundown of personnel for proposed project time schedule
- rough budget
- statement of how project relates to foundation's programs or general purpose.

Groups applying for funds should also give information about their background and interests and could comment on the long- and short-term implications of the project, if it is funded. The formal proposal will give the same information as the concept paper, but in more detail. Potential funding agencies may ask that the proposal be modified, so it may need to be rewritten one or more times.

Ask the agency or foundation how long it will take to get an answer to your funding request, but do not make commitments based on the date you are given or your expectations for funding. Learn about the process your proposal will go through. Sometimes requests take several months to clear the process of review by officials looking at program content and budget. Make a contact in the funding agency so you can call now and then to find out where your proposal is in the process.

Federal Government Funding

The three major sources of federal government funds for criminal justice programs are the Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA); the Department of Labor Manpower Administration; and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Institute of Mental Health, Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency.

Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA). LEAA is the U. S. government's major anti-crime project funding agency. Its budget is more than $800 million. LEAA money is distributed in three ways: through "block grants," discretionary grants and National Institute

54. "BT Guide to Foundations," Behavior Today, August 6, 1973, p. 3. The issue is packed with useful information.

of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice (NILE) grants.

Block grant money, 85 percent of the total, is administered and distributed by State Planning Agencies (SPAs) in every state. (These SPAs have a different name in each state.) The SPA produces a comprehensive plan each year which takes into account the state's needs for every aspect of the criminal justice system--police, courts, corrections, drug programs, juveniles and so on. If your group is seeking LEAA money, it would be advisable to review your state's comprehensive plan. The SPAs accept proposals from agencies and private groups. They decide which proposals should be funded on the basis of the comprehensive plan. The funding is in the form of grants which require a 10 percent "hard cash" match (money from other sources to "match" the federal funds) from the subgrantee.

Discretionary grants are available for certain kinds of programs described in the "Guide for Discretionary Grant Programs," available from LEAA. These, too, require a 10 percent cash match.

NILE funds are available to support research or research and demonstration (with an emphasis on research) projects. These funds are distributed from Washington, D. C., and constitute the smallest of the three LEAA programs.

LEAA application forms and the name of the State Planning Agency in your state can be obtained through the LEAA regional offices listed at the back of this booklet. Because of special requirements for NILE applications, however, applications for NILE should be obtained from Washington, D. C. A list of names and addresses for SPAs is also available from the Public Information Office of LEAA, Washington, D. C. 20530.

Department of Labor, Manpower Administration. The Manpower Administration in fiscal years 1972 and 1973 had about $12 million to distribute or spend for a variety of corrections-related projects. In the future, funds for such projects will be distributed through the revenue sharing mechanism, under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) of 1973 (Public Law 93-203), signed into law by the President on December 28, 1973.

Revenue sharing calls for units of government whose population is 100,000 or greater to become, on application, "prime sponsors." Nearly 500 cities or countries have been identified as eligible for the appellation. The governor acts as prime sponsor for areas not covered by local prime sponsors.

Prime sponsors are to submit a comprehensive manpower plan to the Secretary of Labor. The plan will describe performance goals and direct services toward those most needy in the appropriate geographical area.

Each prime sponsor is to appoint and staff a Planning Council with representatives from the population to be served, local organizations, the employment service, education and training agencies, business, labor, and where desirable, agriculture. States acting as prime sponsors will appoint

a similar group called a Manpower Service Council. Because the CETA is new, details of administration are still being worked out. Persons and groups interested in seeing manpower funds in their community go to offenders should do what they can to influence the content of the comprehensive manpower plan for their area.

Further information about Manpower Administration programs and funding procedures can be supplied by the 10 regional offices, whose addresses are given at the end of this booklet.

Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Institute of Mental Health, Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency. The Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency has about $2.8 million available to support research projects studying various kinds of deviant behavior. This money is available to non-profit institutions. The Center is primarily interested in giving grants for intervention projects or other community programs, as opposed to research in institutional programs. For more information, write to the Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency, NIMH, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, Maryland 20852.

Foundations

Many foundations have funded programs in the field of corrections. Some of these are nationally-known foundations with assets in the millions, others are small, local foundations. The Foundation Center offers assistance to groups and individuals who seek funding. The Center publishes the Foundation Directory, which can be found in the Reference sections of many libraries. It updates the material in the Directory in its information Quarterly. The Center also publishes a Grants Index every year, which gives information on the kinds of projects foundations are supporting.

The Foundation Center maintains two main offices in New York and Washington, D. C., which keep annual reports (primarily Internal Revenue Service forms) on file. Similar collections of annual reports are kept on file in 50 regional centers. The annual reports to the IRS usually give such information as the name and address of the foundation, names and addresses of principal officers, a list of grantees and the dollar amounts of grants given. Sometimes a small description of the grant's purpose is included.

The Center will provide detailed information on foundations to users who know which foundation to ask about. The service is free over the telephone, $3.00 per foundation in writing.

The Foundation Center also offers other services, which are described in brochures available on request. For more information, write the Foundation Center at either 888 7th Avenue, New York, New York 10019 or 1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036.

Other Resources

The National Criminal Justice Reference Service is a clearinghouse of information on studies, reports and books concerning the criminal justice system. Groups or individuals who are actively engaged in criminal justice or law enforcement activities are eligible to join. It is not open to students or other one-time users, although it will supply such people specific free publications, such as its bibliographies. "The Delinquent Girl," and "Women as Offenders Within the Correctional Process." For copies of these publications or for further information on membership, write to the NCJRS in Washington, D. C. 20530.

The Women's Bureau of the Employment Standards Administration, U. S. Department of Labor, is increasing its involvement in supporting programs for women offenders. The Washington, D. C. office (zip code 20210) is acting as a clearinghouse of information on women offenders. Addresses of the Associate Assistant Regional Directors, Women's Bureau, are given at the end of this booklet.

Selected Bibliography

1. Bryant, Florence V., "What is in It for You?: Volunteers and the Correctional System," The Prison Journal, Vol. LII, No. 2, Autumn-Winter, 1972, p. 44.

Describes the development of the relationship between a group of volunteers and the Indiana State Reformatory inmates they have visited once a week for seven and a half years.

Miller, Herbert S. "The Citizen's Role in Changing the Criminal Justice System," Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 19, No. 3, July 1973, p. 343.

Guidelines for citizens who wishe to organize an effective program to improve the criminal justice system.

2. Burkhart, Kathryn Watterson, Women in Prison, Doubleday and Company, Inc., New York, 1973.

Lengthy but valuable description of corrections for women.

Chandler, Edna Walker, Women in Prison, Bobbs-Merrill, Indianapolis, 1973.

Interesting for its wealth of information about programs in women's prisons. See Appendix.

"Joan Henry," Women in Prison, Doubleday and Company, Inc., New York, 1952.

Pseudonymous, exceptionally well-written account of one woman's stay in English prisons. Readable, if not entirely relevant to the American situation.

3. Goldfarb, Ronald L. and Singer, Linda R., After Conviction, Simon and Schuster, New York, 1973.

Throughly documented work covering every aspect of post-conviction experience, from prison life through alternatives to incarceration and post-incarceration community programs.

Mitford, Jessica, Kind and Usual Punishment, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1973.

A popularly-oriented book giving the lowdown on how prisoners can be exploited by programs designed to "treat" them.

4. Publications of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, a high-powered group of experts commissioned to study the American criminal justice system and make recommendations. Its recommendations were published in 1973. The publications are entitled A National Strategy to Reduce Crime ($2.55), Report on Police ($6.65), Report on Courts ($3.95), Report on Corrections ($6.30), Report on Criminal Justice System ($3.35), and Report on Community Crime Prevention ($3.75). Write to Manager, Public Documents Distribution Center, 5801 Tabor Ave., Philadelphia, Pa. 19120.

5. For other books and articles, see the footnotes and the two bibliographies available from the National Criminal Justice Reference Service, Washington, D. C. 20530.

Addresses

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
ASSOCIATE ASSISTANT REGIONAL DIRECTORS, WOMEN'S BUREAU

Region I - Boston (Conn., Me., Mass., N.H., R.I., Vt.)	AARD/WB Rm. 1612-C, JFK Bldg. Boston, Mass. 02203
Region II - New York (N.J., N.Y., Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands)	AARD/WB Rm. 3302 1515 Broadway New York, New York 10036
Region III - Philadelphia (Dela., D.C., Md., Pa., Va., W.Va.)	AARD/WB 15th Floor Gateway Building 3535 Market Street Philadelphia, Pa. 19104
Region IV - Atlanta (Ala., Fla., Ga., Ky., Miss., N.C., S.C., Tenn.)	AARD/WB Rm. 315 1371 Peachtree Street, N.E. Atlanta, Ga. 30309
Region V - Chicago (Ill., Ind., Mich., Minn., Ohio, Wisc.)	AARD/WB Rm. 732 219 S. Dearborn Street Chicago, Ill. 60604
Region VI - Dallas (Ark., La., N.M., Okla., Texas)	AARD/WB Rm. 13F12, Federal Bldg. 1100 Commerce Street Dallas, Texas 75202
Region VII - Kansas City (Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska)	AARD/WB 2000 Federal Bldg. 911 Walnut Street Kansas City, Mo. 64104
Region VIII - Denver (Colo., Mont., N.D., S.D., Utah, Wyo.)	AARD/WB 15412 Federal Bldg. 1961 Stout Street Denver Colo. 80202

Region IX - San Francisco (Ariz., Calif., Hawaii, Nevada)	AARD/WB Rm. 10341, Box 36017 450 Golden Gate Avenue San Francisco, Calif. 94102
Region X - Seattle (Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, Washington)	AARD/WB 2015 Smith Tower 506 Second Avenue Seattle, Wash. 98104

LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION

REGIONAL OFFICES

Region I - Boston
Regional Administrator
LEAA - U. S. Dept. of Justice
147 Milk Street, Suite 800
Boston, Massachusetts 02109

Region II - New York
Regional Administrator
LEAA - U. S. Dept. of Justice
26 Federal Plaza, Rm. 1337
Federal Office Building
New York, New York 10007

Region III - Philadelphia
Regional Administrator
LEAA - U. S. Dept. of Justice
325 Chestnut Street, Suite 800
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106

Region IV - Atlanta
Regional Administrator
LEAA - U. S. Dept. of Justice
730 Peachtree Street, N.E., Rm. 985
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

Region V - Chicago
Regional Administrator
LEAA - U. S. Dept. of Justice
O'Hare Office Center, Rm. 121
3166 Des Plaines Avenue
Des Plaines, Illinois 60018

Region VI - Dallas
Regional Administrator
LEAA - U.S. Dept of Justice
500 S. Ervay Street, Suite 313-C
Dallas, Texas 75201

Region VII - Kansas City
Regional Administrator
LEAA - U.S. Dept. of Justice
436 State Avenue
Kansas City, Kansas 66101

Region VIII - Denver
Regional Administrator
LEAA - U.S. Dept. of Justice
Federal Building, Rm. 6519
Denver, Colorado 80202

Region IX - San Francisco
Regional Administrator
LEAA - U.S. Dept. of Justice
1860 El Camino Real, 3rd Floor
Burlingame, California 94010

Region X - Seattle
Regional Administrator
LEAA - U.S. Dept. of Justice
130 Andover Building
Seattle, Washington 98188

MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION

REGIONAL OFFICES

Region I - Boston
Regional Manpower Administrator
U. S. Department of Labor
Rm. 1703 J. F. Kennedy Bldg.
Government Center
Boston, Massachusetts 02203

Region II - New York
Regional Manpower Administrator
U. S. Department of Labor
1515 Broadway
Room 3611
New York, New York 10036

Region III - Philadelphia
Regional Manpower Administrator
U. S. Department of Labor
3535 Market Street
Gateway Building
Philadephia, Pennsylvania 19104

Region IV - Atlanta
Regional Manpower Administrator
U. S. Department of Labor
1317 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Room 405
Atlanta, Georgia 30309

Region V - Chicago
Regional Manpower Administrator
U. S. Department of Labor
300 S. Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606

District of Columbia
D. C. Manpower Administrator
Manpower Administration
U. S. Department of Labor
District Building, Rm. 220
14th & E Streets, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20004

Region VI - Dallas
Regional Manpower Administrator
U. S. Department of Labor
Federal Building
1100 Commerce Street
Dallas, Texas 75202

Region VII - Kansas City
Regional Manpower Administrator
U. S. Department of Labor
Federal Building
911 Walnut Street
Kansas City, Missouri 64106

Region VIII - Denver
Regional Manpower Administrator
U. S. Department of Labor
16015 Federal Office Building
1961 Stout Street
Denver, Colorado 80202

Region IX - San Francisco
Regional Manpower Administrator
U. S. Department of Labor
Federal Building, Room 10064
450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36084
San Francisco, California 94102

Region X - Seattle
Regional Manpower Administrator
U. S. Department of Labor
2154 Arcade Plaza
1321 Second Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98101

PROGRAMS

ABA Clearinghouse on Offender Employment Restrictions
1705 DeSales Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Bureau of Rehabilitation
1111 H Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20001

Community College Night Owl Program
Harold Matthews, Dean of Vocational Instruction
Jackson Community College
211 Emmons Road
Jackson, Michigan 49201

Cosmetology Program
Sebenia Berry, Supervisor
Cosmetology Training Program
California Institution for Women
Rural Route No. 1
Frontera, California 91720

Crossroads
Superior Court Building
400 F Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20001

Department of Court Services
Fifth Judicial District
610 College Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa 50314

Honeywell Computer Programming Project
Malcolm D. Smith, Group Manager
Honeywell Information Systems, Inc.
60 Walnut Street
Wellesley, Massachusetts 02181

Institutional Training Project
C. Noell Damron, Project Director
305 West Monument Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

Introductory Vocational Program
Dana G. Straight, Supervisor of Education
Robert F. Kennedy Youth Center
Morgantown, West Virginia 26505

Licensed Vocational Nurse Training
Barbara R. Taylor, R.N.
Director of Nursing Education
Rincon Inter-Community School of Vocational Nursing
California Institution for Women
Rural Route No. 1
Frontera, California 91720

Man to Man
725 15th Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20005

One America, Inc.
1330 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20005

Talbert House
334 McGregor Avenue
Cincinnati, Ohio 45219

Training Release in a Small Institution
Ricky Littlefield, Community Service Coordinator
Minnesota Correctional Institution for Women
Box C
Shakopee, Minnesota 55379

Vera Institute of Justice
30 East 39th Street
New York, New York 10016

Visitors' Services Center
1422 Massachusetts Avenue, S. E.
Washington, D. C. 20003

Washington Opportunities for Women
1111 20th Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Washington Dismas Project
1200 Varnum Street, N. E.
Washington, D. C. 20017

J-6332-74